



PATENTS

AP  
JRW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of James M. Etkin

Serial No. 09/740,371

Examiner Kelly Scaggs Campen

Confirmation No. 4946

Filed: December 19, 2000

Group 3624

For: Matching Program and System for Corporate Meeting Planners and Hospitality Providers

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
Mail Stop AF

Sir:

Please find enclosed for filing:

- Amendment with certificate of mailing (4 pages)
- Return Receipt Postcard
- Please debit/credit Deposit Account No. 03-1231 for any underpayments/overpayments.  
This Transmittal Letter is submitted in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

By

Robert C. Kain, Jr.  
Reg. No. 30,648  
Fleit, Kain, Gibbons, Gutman, Bongini & Bianco, P.L.  
750 Southeast Third Avenue, Suite 100  
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33316-1153  
Telephone: 954-768-9002  
Facsimile: 954-768-0158

Docket No.: 6787-03

**Certificate of Mailing**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 4, 2006.

Robert C. Kain, Jr.  
Reg. No. 30,648



PATENTS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of James M. Etkin

Serial No. 09/740,371

Examiner Kelly Scaggs Campen

Filed: December 19, 2000

Group 3624

For: Matching Program and System for Corporate Meeting Planners and Hospitality Providers

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a response to the Final Office Action dated April 7, 2006. In the Final Office Action, the examiner (a) withdrew the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of claims 1-9 but (b) indicated that claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,664,115 to Fraser ("Fraser '115").

The examiner stated:

In response to applicant's argument that the reference fails to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "complicated exchange of information between a buyer ... and a seller or vendor ... than is customary in the exchange of information regarding the buying and selling of real estate or a building") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

Office Action, p. 4.

It is respectfully requested that the examiner is incorrect in this statement. Independent claim 1 clearly indicates that "requirement data" is data "representing respective necessities of a plurality of meeting planners for a corresponding plurality of meetings or events." Data for meetings and